



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/718,524

11/24/2003

David James Wilson

ALC 3098

1982

7590 10/16/2007
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
Suite 240
1725 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PHAM, KHANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/16/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,524

Applicant(s)

WILSON, DAVID JAMES

Examiner

Khanh B. Pham

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/1/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed August 1, 2007 has been entered. Claims 1, 21, 24, and 25 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 24-26 are directed to a computer readable medium memory storing a prefix length array and a search area for storing prefix length search tree, which are nonfunctional descriptive material. Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ

at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation : “provide an associated entry into said hash table consisting of at least 128 bits”, which was not described in the specification in such way as to reasonably convey to one of skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2166

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-21, 23-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis (US 2004/0085953 A1), hereinafter "**Davis**", in view of Yu et al. (Forwarding Engine for Fast Routing Lookups and Updates"), hereinafter "**Yu**".

As per claim 1, Davis teaches a method of forwarding protocol data units in a router with a forwarding comprising:

- a) "selecting a window size of n window bits" at [0017], [0022]-[0023] and Figs. 2, 3A-B;
- b) "generating a grouping table with sets of prefix lengths based on said window size" at [0017]-[0018], [0026] and Figs. 2-5;
- c) "using said n window bits as a direct index into said grouping table to find an initial prefix length and provide an associated entry into said hash table consisting of at least 128 bits" at [0017]-[0018], [0026] and Figs. 2-5;
- d) "performing a lookup in said hash table based on said initial prefix length for matching said window bits with the bits of said associated entry" at [0016]-[0017] and Figs. 2-5;

Davis does not explicitly teach the use of "an offset of o offset bits" as claimed. However, Yu teaches a similar method for data routing including the step of selecting "sliding window" in conjunction with an offset bits at page 1558, Col. 2, 3rd paragraph.

Art Unit: 2166

Yu suggest adding an offset bits to select the window in order to “distribute route prefixes evenly because “we defined these extraction fields based on first observing that patterns of trailing bits of an IP address or route prefix are more randomly distributed than those of leading bits” Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Yu with Davis’s teaching” in order to distribute route prefixes evenly and therefore reduce hash collision and improve searching speed.

As per claim 2, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above.

Davis also teaches:

- e)“generating one of a hit pointer and a miss pointer in response to said lookup and loading said hit and miss pointer in to binary search tree” at [0026]-[0027] and Figs. 2-5;
- f)“determining the next prefix length for a respective miss pointer and hit pointer” at [0026]-[0027] and Figs. 2-5;
- g)“performing a further lookup in said hash table based on said next prefix length for matching said window bits with the bits of a further associated entry in said hash table” at [0026]-[0027] and Figs. 2-5.

As per claim 3, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 2 discussed above.

Davis further teaches “repeating steps e), f) and g) until a longest matching prefix is obtained” at [0016], [0026]-[0027], [0033].

As per claim 4, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 3 discussed above. Davis further teaches "forwarding said PDU along a route identify by an IP address in said hash table corresponding to said longest matching prefix" at [0016], [0026].

As per claim 5, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Yu also teaches "selecting said offset such that the maximum number of prefix lengths per set is a minimum" at page 1558, Col. 2, 3rd paragraph.

As per claim 6, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Yu also teaches: "selecting said offset such that the average number of prefix length per set is minimized" at page 1558, Col. 2, 3rd paragraph.

As per claim 7, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Yu also teaches: "dynamically tuning the order of prefix lengths searched in said grouping table using statistical data collected at said router" at section 5.2.1 and 5.2.2. and 9.

As per claim 8, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 7 discussed above. Yu also teaches: "wherein said statistical data indicate the hits for each prefix lengths in each set" at section 5.2.1 and 5.2.2.

As per claim 9, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 7 discussed above. Yu also teaches: "said lookup is dynamically tuned to process the prefix lengths in order from the prefix lengths with a greater percentage of hits" at section 5.2.1 and 5.2.2. and 9.

As per claim 10, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "said hash table is updated when said window is updated" at [0040].

As per claim 11, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Davis also teaches "wherein said window is a uni-dimensional window comprising a predetermined number of consecutive bits" at Figs. 2-3A-B.

As per claim 12, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Davis Yu also teaches: "wherein said window is a multi-dimensional window comprising a predetermined number of groups of consecutive bits" at [0028] and Figs. 2, 3AB.

As per claim 13, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "wherein the number of bits of said windows is selected for enabling said grouping table to fit into a fast memory" at [0031]-[0032] and Figs. 3A-B.

As per claim 14, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "wherein the window size n is user-selectable" at [0017].

As per claim 15, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 2 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "selecting said offset using said binary tree" at [0006], [0028] and Figs. 3A-B.

As per claim 16, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 2 discussed above. Davis also teaches "wherein said binary tree is made up of a root tree generated by said offset bits, partial trees within said window generated by said window bits, and sub-tree subtended by said partial trees" at [0006], [0028] and Figs. 3A-B.

As per claim 17, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 16 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "the number of prefix lengths searched for said window and said offset is a set union of the prefix lengths in said root tree, the prefix lengths of the sub-trees grouped by said window bits, and the extended prefix lengths occurring within the window grouped by said window bits" at [0006], [0028] , [0031] and Figs. 3A-B.

As per claim 18, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 17 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "wherein said set union is obtained by iterating over all nodes of the tree within said window" at [0006], [0028] , [0031] and Figs. 3A-B.

As per claim 19, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "wherein said n and o are chosen periodically on a best effort basis" at [0016], [0040].

As per claim 20, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 1 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "wherein said n and o are chosen at router startup, and updated as a low priority background application" [0020], [0040] and Fig. 5.

As per claim 21, Davis teaches a method of forwarding a protocol data unit (PDU) at a router with a forwarding hash table containing prefix lengths comprising:

- "dividing the prefix lengths available in said hash table into groups" at Fig. 3B;
- "routing said PDU according to a lookup in said hash table based on the prefix lengths in a selected group of said groups" at Fig. 3B.
- "wherein said step of dividing comprises selecting a window of n bits from an IP address of said PDU consisting of 128 bits" at [0017] and Figs. 2-5;
- "and arranging said selected group in the form of a grouping table with all prefix lengths available for said n bits" at Figs. 3B;

Davis does not explicitly teach the use of "said prefix lengths are based on n and a number of offset bits" as claimed. However, Yu teaches a similar method for data routing including the step of selecting "sliding window" of size n in conjunction with an offset bits at page 1558, Col. 2, 3rd paragraph. Yu suggest adding an offset bits to select the window in order to "distribute route prefixes evenly because "we defined these extraction fields based on first observing that patterns of trailing bits of an IP address or route prefix are more randomly distributed than those of leading bits" Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was

made to combine Yu with Davis's teaching" in order to distribute route prefixes evenly and therefore reduce hash collision and improve searching speed.

As per claim 23, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 21 discussed above. Davis also teaches: "using said n bits for finding an initial prefix length in said grouping table, to determine an associated entry into said hash table; and "performing a look up in said hash table based on said initial prefix length for matching" at Fig. 3B.

As per claim 24, Davis teaches a computer readable medium memory for storing data for access by a routing program being executed on a router having a hash table comprising:

- "a prefix length array of an address including at least 128 bits for storing a grouping table comprising 2^n entries, each entry corresponding to a prefix length available for matching n bits of an IP address of a protocol data unit (PDU) at [0017], [0036] and Figs. 3A, 4;
- "a search area for storing a prefix length search tree constructed using said grouping table based on lookup in said hash table, said lookup being performed for a prefix length in said grouping table, using said n bits in said IP address" at [0031], [0040].

Davis teaches the prefix length is based on n at [0017] but does not explicitly teach the use of "the prefix length is based on n and a number of offset bits" as claimed. However, Yu teaches a similar method for data routing including the step of selecting

“sliding window” in conjunction with an offset bits at page 1558, Col. 2, 3rd paragraph.

Yu suggest adding an offset bits to select the window in order to “distribute route prefixes evenly because “we defined these extraction fields based on first observing that patterns of trailing bits of an IP address or route prefix are more randomly distributed than those of leading bits” Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Yu with Davis’s teaching” in order to distribute route prefixes evenly and therefore reduce hash collision and improve searching speed.

As per claim 25, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 24 discussed above. Davis teaches that “n is selected small enough so that said grouping table fits into a memory for a product selected from the group consisting of a general purpose processor, a network processor, an ASIC and an FPGA” at [0031]-[0032].

As per claim 26, Davis and Yu teaches the method of claim 24 discussed above. Yu also teaches: “said prefix length search tree is constructed based on dynamic flow measurements to favor prefix lengths with are used by the majority of the PDU at said router” at section 5.2.1 and 5.2.2.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed August 1, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments.

In view of applicant's amendment, the 35 U.S.C 112, 2nd paragraph rejection to claim 25 has been withdrawn.

Applicant's argument regarding the 35 U.S.C 101 rejection to claims 24-26 has been considered but is not persuasive. Claims 24-26, as amended, are directed to a computer readable medium storing a set of data. However, the stored data is mere arrangement of data. **Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, does not make it statutory.** See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

Regarding the 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection, applicant argued that Davis and Yu, as combine, does not disclose "an address including at least 128 bits". On the contrary, Davis teaches at paragraph [0017] that "The principle of the invention also apply to other version of IP address (e.g. Ipv6, which are 128 bits in length) and to other indices of longer or shorter lengths."

In light of the foregoing arguments, the 35 U.S.C 103 rejection is hereby sustained.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2166

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh B. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-4116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2166

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Khanh B. Pham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2166

October 11, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kpham', is written over a horizontal line.